



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,640	10/18/2001	Jeffrey P. Szmanda	801001	8158
30327	7590	08/04/2006	EXAMINER	
CHARLES R. SZMANDA 4 CROSSMAN AVENUE WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581			NGUYEN, CAM LINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

AUG 4 2006

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/982,640
Filing Date: October 18, 2001
Appellant(s): SZMANDA, JEFFREY P.

Charles R. Szmanda
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 5/11/2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 11/09/2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,098,065	SKILLEN	8-2000
6,421,652	LOEB	7-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Art Unit: 2161

1. Claims 1 – 42, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Skillen et al (U.S. 6,098,065).

♦ As per claim 1,

Skillen et al (U.S. 6,098,065) discloses a method of supplying advertisement information to a user searching for information comprising:

- “Receiving from the user, a series of search rules comprising facts about an advertisement” See col. 4 lines 5 – 6. The “search rules” as defined in the application, comprises keywords or phrases (paragraph 0035); Skillen provides a search argument that comprises plurality of terms. Therefore, the search rules corresponds to the “search arguments” that received from the user.
- “Accessing a database comprising details of a plurality of advertisements” See col. 4, lines 31 – 40.
- “Using a search engine to apply said search rules to said database” See Fig. 1, element 16, 18, col. 4, lines 31 – 45.
- “Reporting to the user results comprising a subset of the content of said database” col. 4, lines 46 – 48.

♦ As per claim 2, 7, 12, 19, 26, 33,

- “The user experienced said advertisement previously”. Because the search request includes “desired information” (col. 1 lines 42 – 43), therefore, the user must experience with the advertisement or must see/know and show an interested in it in order to make the request.

♦ As per claim 3, 8, 13, 20, 27, 34,

Art Unit: 2161

- “The data network comprises the Internet” See Fig. 1, element 14, col. 3, lines 53 – 55.
- ◆ As per claim 4, 9, 14 - 16, 21 – 23, 28 – 30, 35 – 37, 41, 43,
 - “The algorithm of said search engine is selected from a group consisting of deductive reasoning, fuzzy logic and abductive reasoning” See col. 4, lines 14 – 25.
- ◆ As per claim 5, 10, 17, 24, 31, 38,
 - “Said advertisement information comprises contact information” referring to the specification “Search results can be in the form of contact information to enable the user to contact the advertiser or the advertiser's designee”. According to col. 4 lines 64 – col. 5 lines 6, a user can connect to the seller by clicking on the page displayed. This page displayed includes a site address. Therefore, the address corresponds to the “contact information”.
- ◆ As per claim 6, 18, 32,
 - “Said user is a customer” See Fig. 1, the end user can be any type of user. In addition, the phrase “user is a customer” is considered as Nonfunctional descriptive material (See MPEP, section 2106 section VI), and cannot render nonobvious an invention that would have otherwise been obvious. If the prior art suggest that a user is an en user, merely choosing a user is a customer, would be presumed to be well within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. The difference between the prior art and the claimed invention is simply a rearrangement of nonfunctional descriptive material.
- ◆ As per claim 11, 25,

With all limitation as claimed in claim 1 further claims 11, 25 include:

Art Unit: 2161

- “Querying the user to obtain one or more search rules” See col. 5 lines 7 – 17, col. 6 lines 4 – 12. The user profile is maintained in the database 48, fig. 2. This information is accessed each time a new search is received. Therefore, the profile is corresponding to additional one or more search rules.
- “ A first and second search engine to refine the search result” See Fig. 1, element 16, 18, col. 4, lines 49 – 55.

♦ As per claim 39, 42

With all limitations as in claim 1, further claim 39 and 42 include a “Search terms comprising words having targeted connotative significance to a particular demographic segment”. See col. 2, lines 44 – 49.

♦ As per claim 40,

- “ Said user is an advertiser” See col. 5, lines 3 – 6. “ An advertiser” corresponds to the “seller”.

2. Claims 1 – 10, 39 – 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Loeb et al (U.S. 6,421,652).

♦ As per claim 1,

Loeb et al (U.S. 6,421,652) discloses a method for supplying advertisement information to a user searching for said information within a data network, comprising:

- “ Receiving from the user, a series of search rules comprising facts about an advertisement” See Fig. 8, element 820, col. 9 lines 45 – 54. In particular,

- “A series of search rules” corresponds to the responses to the plurality of questions from the user.
 - These responses comprise information about a particular magazine or trade publications that the user interested in, and is advertised by number of ways (col. 9 lines 12 – 19).
- “Accessing a database comprising details of a plurality of advertisements” See col. 5, lines 40 – 48.
 - “Using a search engine to apply said search rules to said database” See Fig. 2, element 260, col. 5, lines 40 – 48. The “Search engine” corresponds to the “search server” 260.
 - “Reporting to the user results comprising a subset of the content of said database” See Fig. 8, element 830, col. 9, lines 54 – 58.
- ◆ As per claim 2, 7, 12, 19, 26, 33,
- “The user experienced said advertisement previously”. Because the advertising can be advertised in different ways such as flyer, or website (col. 9, lines 18 – 19, 24 – 26), the user must experience with the promotion and show an interest in it in order to make the request.
- ◆ As per claim 3, 8, 13, 20, 27, 34,
- “The data network comprises the Internet” See col. 4, lines 14 – 16.
- ◆ As per claim 4, 9, 14 - 16, 21 – 23, 28 – 30, 35 – 37, 41, 44,
- “The algorithm of said search engine is selected from a group consisting of deductive reasoning, fuzzy logic and abductive reasoning” See Fig. 10, col. 12, lines 2 – 6.
- ◆ As per claim 5, 10, 17, 24, 31, 38,

Art Unit: 2161

- “ Said advertisement information comprises contact information” See Fig. 5 – 6, col. 8, lines 45 – 51.

◆ As per claim 6, 18, 32,

- “ Said user is a customer” See Fig. 1, where “customer” corresponds to the “consumer”.
In addition, the phrase “user is a customer” is considered as Nonfunctional descriptive material (See MPEP, section 2106 section VI), and cannot render nonobvious an invention that would have otherwise been obvious. If the prior art suggest that a user is a consumer, merely choosing a user is a customer, would be presumed to be well within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. The difference between the prior art and the claimed invention is simply a rearrangement of nonfunctional descriptive material.

◆ As per claim 39, 42

With all limitations as in claim 1, further claim 39 in includes a “Search terms comprising words having targeted connotative significance to a particular demographic segment”. Referring to Fig. 11C, the user must enter their choices by selecting the appropriate answer or type in the answer (col. 13, lines 23 – 28). These responses correspond to the “search terms” that comprising plurality of words.

◆ As per claim 40,

- “ Said user is an advertiser” See col. 1, lines 42 – 53.

3. Claims 11 - 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeb et al (U.S. 6,421,652).

◆ As per claim 11, 25,

Art Unit: 2161

With all limitation as claimed in claim 1 further claims 11, 25 include:

- “Querying the user to obtain one or more search rules” corresponds to the questions that to be asked by the controller.

Applicant uses a first and second search engine to refine the search result. Referring to Fig. 10, element 1025 – 1040, Loeb discloses a logic for eliminate the result by providing more questions to be asked to the consumer. As the result, only a certain numbers of magazines are available for certain consumer (See Fig. 11B). clearly, Loeb discloses a method to refine the search result using a search engine. However, Loeb does not clearly disclose two separate search engines. Loeb, refers to another search engine to do the job if the current fails (see Fig. 2, element 262, col. 5, lines 16 – 18, 47 – 48). It is clear that the claimed provision is inherent. Nonetheless, to expedite prosecution, even if the limitation of the above were not inherent, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use multiple search engines to search for information, because it provides more availability of the system to the user in the searching process.

◆ As per claim 12 – 24, 26 – 38 are rejected based on the rejections above.

(10) Response to Argument

In Appellant’s Brief, filed May 11, 2006, Appellant argues (12) specific points:

- 1) Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “receiving, from the user, a series of search rules comprising facts about an advertisement” (page 11 and 28 of the Appeal Brief).
- 2) Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “accessing a database comprising details of a plurality of advertisements” (page 13 and 30 of the Appeal Brief).

- 3) Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “ using a search engine to apply said search rules to said database” (page 14 and 31 of the Appeal Brief).
- 4) Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “reporting, to the user, results comprising a subset of the contents of said database” (page 14 and 31 of the Appeal Brief).
- 5) Skillen does not disclose: “querying the user to obtain one or more search rules comprising facts about an advertisement” (page 15 of the Appeal Brief).
- 6) Skillen does not disclose: “using a first search engine to apply said search rules to said database to obtain results comprising a first subset of the contents of said database” (page 17 of the Appeal Brief).
- 7) Skillen does not disclose: “receiving, from the user, one or more keywords; using said keywords and a second search engine to query said first subset” (page 17 of the Appeal Brief).
- 8) Skillen does not disclose: “reporting, to the user, results comprising a second subset of the contents of said database, wherein said second subset is smaller than said first subset” (page 18 of the Appeal Brief).
- 9) Skillen does not disclose: “receiving, from the user, a first list of keywords; generating a second list of keywords, said second list comprising keywords or phrases synonymously related to one or more keywords or phrase in said first list” (page 19 of the Appeal Brief).
- 10) Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “receiving a set of search terms comprising words having targeted connotative significance to a particular demographic segment” (page 20 and 33 of the Appeal Brief).

Art Unit: 2161

11) Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “reporting results of the search comprising a subset of the contents of said database, said results being indexed uniquely” (page 23 and 36 of the Appeal Brief).

12) Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “repeating steps (a) – (d) a number of times with at least one different search term in said list, said number being sufficient to cover the desired demographic space” (page 23 and 36 of the Appeal Brief).

The Federal Circuit has embraced a theory of *prima facie* obviousness for use in *ex parte* prosecution in the PTO. The *prima facie* case is a procedural tool that, as used in patent examination, means not only that the evidence of the prior art would reasonably allow the conclusion that the examiner seeks, but also that the prior art compels such a conclusion if the Appellant produces no evidence or argument to rebut it. See *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In the instant case, the prior art compels the conclusion that the claimed invention is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as set forth in the Final Office Action, mailed November 9, 2005, and reiterated above for convenience.

Each of Appellant’s (12) arguments above fails to rebut the *prima facie* showing of obviousness for the reasons discussed below.

EXAMINER’S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT’S ARGUMENT 1:

Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “receiving, from the user, a series of search rules comprising facts about an advertisement” (page 11 and 28 of the Appeal Brief).

First, Appellant’s first argument is unpersuasive because Skillen clearly discloses a search engine that allows the user to input the search information (search rules) that comprising

Art Unit: 2161

the desired information (facts about an advertisement) (See col. 1, lines 50 – 57, col. 4, lines 29 – 30 of Skillen). The system of Skillen is an advertising system (col. 2, lines 44 – 45 of Skillen). Therefore, the information in the system that the user searching is the advertisement information.

Second, Appellant's first argument is unpersuasive because Loeb clearly discloses that at col. 9, lines 10 – 65, the system is an advertising system, so that the information can be advertised to the user in numerous ways. The information that the user enters into the question corresponds to the "search rules comprising facts about an advertisement" since the user using the advertisement system to search or subscribe to a particular publication.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 2:

Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: "accessing a database comprising details of a plurality of advertisements" (page 13 and 30 of the Appeal Brief).

Skillen discloses that the search engine in the advertising system (col. 2, lines 44 – 45 of Skillen) will search for the match in response to the user query (col. 4, lines 31 – 40 of Skillen).

Therefore, the database in Skillen must comprising details of a plurality of advertisements.

In the same manner, Loeb also discloses that the system also allows to compare the input by the user with the stored value (col. 9, lines 54 – 65, Loeb). Therefore, the database in Loeb also comprises details of a plurality of advertisements.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 3:

Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: " using a search engine to apply said search rules to said database" (page 14 and 31 of the Appeal Brief).

Appellant's argument is unpersuasive because Skillen clearly discloses a search engine that allows the user to input the search information (search rules) that comprising the desired

Art Unit: 2161

information (facts about an advertisement) (See Fig.1, element 16, 18, col. 1, lines 50 – 57, col. 4, lines 29 - 30 of Skillen).

Loeb also has to use a search engine to retrieve and compare the input form the user and the information in the database (col. 9, lines 54 – 65 of Loeb).

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 4:

Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: “reporting, to the user, results comprising a subset of the contents of said database” (page 14 and 31 of the Appeal Brief).

Appellant's argument is unpersuasive because Skillen clearly discloses a system that returns search result to the user. The result corresponds to a “subset of the contents of said database” (col. 4, lines 41 – 45 of Skillen).

Loeb also teaches that the user will receive the appropriate trade publications based on the input (col. 9, lines 54 – 65 of Loeb). Therefore, the trade publication corresponds to the result that is a “subset of the contents of said database”.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 5:

Skillen does not disclose: “querying the user to obtain one or more search rules comprising facts about an advertisement” (page 15 of the Appeal Brief).

By obtaining the user profile and the search rule, Skillen clearly teaches that the system queries the user to obtain one or more search rules comprising facts about an advertisement (col. 6, lines 1 – 12 of Skillen).

Loeb teaches that the advertising can be provided in a number of ways, such as sending a universal questionnaire (col. 9, lines 14 – 44). The questionnaire corresponds to the search rule

Art Unit: 2161

that is sent to the user in order to querying the user to obtain one or more search rules comprising facts about an advertisement.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 6:

Skillen does not disclose: “using a first search engine to apply said search rules to said database to obtain results comprising a first subset of the contents of said database” (page 17 of the Appeal Brief).

As shown in Fig. 1, Skillen discloses a two different search engine, database search engine and associative search engine to retrieve the result from the database. Therefore, Skillen clearly disclose “using a first search engine to apply said search rules to said database to obtain results comprising a first subset of the contents of said database”.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 7:

Skillen does not disclose: “receiving, from the user, one or more keywords; using said keywords and a second search engine to query said first subset” (page 17 of the Appeal Brief).

Appellant's argument is unpersuasive because Skillen clearly discloses the end user sends the search argument to the database search engine (col. 4, lines 29 – 30 of Skillen). Therefore, the search argument corresponds to the keywords in the claim invention. Using this search argument (keywords), the second search engine will search again the result as the user want to refine the search (col. 4, lines 46 – 55 of Skillen).

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 8:

Skillen does not disclose: “reporting, to the user, results comprising a second subset of the contents of said database, wherein said second subset is smaller than said first subset” (page 18 of the Appeal Brief).

Art Unit: 2161

As in argument 7, the user can refine the search result. Therefore, the second result coming back to the user corresponds to the second subset of the contents of said database, and second subset is smaller than said first subset.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 9:

Skillen does not disclose: "receiving, from the user, a first list of keywords; generating a second list of keywords, said second list comprising keywords or phrases synonymously related to one or more keywords or phrase in said first list" (page 19 of the Appeal Brief).

This operation corresponds to the method that allows the user to enter search argument and then refine the search (see response above). The refine search comprises the search argument or additional search keyword that related to the first result. Therefore, the refine search argument corresponds to the second list of keywords, said second list comprising keywords or phrases synonymously related to one or more keywords or phrase in said first list.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 10:

Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: "receiving a set of search terms comprising words having targeted connotative significance to a particular demographic segment" (page 20 and 33 of the Appeal Brief).

The Examiner interpreted the phrase "search terms comprising words having targeted connotative significance to a particular demographic segment" corresponds to the search argument in Skillen and the universal questionnaire in Loeb.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 11:

Art Unit: 2161

Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: "reporting results of the search comprising a subset of the contents of said database, said results being indexed uniquely" (page 23 and 36 of the Appeal Brief).

Skillen teaches that the result is presented to the use in a predictive order and fashion (col. 2, lines 23 – 30 of Skillen). Therefore, the results are being indexed uniquely.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT 12:

Skillen and Loeb do not disclose: "repeating steps (a) – (d) a number of times with at least one different search term in said list, said number being sufficient to cover the desired demographic space" (page 23 and 36 of the Appeal Brief).

Skillen discloses this technique by allowing the user to refine the search in order to retrieve the desired information.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Nguyen, Cam-Linh

Conferees:

Jeffrey Gaffin

SPE -art unit 2165



Chace Christian

SPE -art unit 2161